

You'll see what I mean when you hear the story.

This guy took a trip to Las Vegas and did what so many others do—he lost his money, including his fare home. While figuring out what to do, as sometimes happens, he had to go. When he got to the bathroom, he discovered that they had not a nickel or dime but quarter stalls. He didn't have any money, so he was in pretty bad shape. And then a gentleman came by and he told the gentleman his problem. The guy said, "I'll give you a quarter . . . I don't care if you give it back to me or not, it's no problem." He took the quarter and went back into the restroom, and just as he was about to put the quarter in, he realized the door had been left open. So he put the quarter in his pocket and he went in . . . He realized that a quarter wasn't going to get him back to Los Angeles and wouldn't even feed him. So, he put the quarter in a slot machine. And it wouldn't be a story if he didn't hit the jackpot.

Then he hit the bigger jackpot . . . and he went to the crap table; he went to the roulette table. He ended up with about ten or fifteen thousand dollars. He went back home and invested in the right stock. He got the right business together. And in pretty short order, about fifteen years, he became the second wealthiest man in the world. He was asked about this story on television and began by saying, "I am so indebted to that benefactor of mine. That man who made all of this possible. And if he comes forth and proves who he is, I will give him half my wealth in cash. So a man came forth . . . He said, 'Are you sure you are the one I'm looking for?' 'Of course, he said, 'I'm the man who gave you that quarter.' The millionaire said 'I'm not looking for you. I'm looking for the man who left the door open.' You see, if he hadn't left the door open, I would have put the quarter in the stall."

Marshall epitomizes the man who left the door open. We are all millionaires—even billionaires—rich from Marshall's legacy of opening doors for those less fortunate. As we close this era, we must not forget his impact on the events of the 20th Century.

Marshall was instrumental in supporting the rights of minorities and immigrants; limiting government intrusion in cases involving illegal search and seizure, double jeopardy, and the right to privacy; and in creating new protections under the law for women, children, prisoners, and the homeless.

His legacy has inspired Americans to name educational institutions, Federal Buildings, legal societies, libraries, and numerous academic achievement awards in his honor. It is indeed my honor to recognize a man whose career is a monument to our judiciary system and who has inspired so many to continue his quiet crusade.

Marshall was born and raised in the Congressional District I represent—Baltimore City, Maryland—and lived in a home about eight blocks from where I live now. We both attended Howard University and, more significantly, he was once turned away from the law school I attended and graduated from—the University of Maryland. As such, I am especially proud to honor Thurgood Marshall, as I share a common background with him.

Through his knowledge, advocacy and devotion to the cause of civil rights, Marshall contributed to the battle fought in the United States courts to eradicate the legacy of slav-

ery. I believe, however, that he should be revered most for his courage and independent judiciary and for breathing life into the text of the Constitution. He worked tirelessly to guarantee all Americans equality and liberty in their individual choices concerning voting, housing, education and travel.

In 1954, he argued the case of *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* before the Supreme Court, where racial segregation in public schools was declared unconstitutional.

He won 29 of the 32 cases he argued before the Supreme Court, including, cases in which the court declared unconstitutional:

A Southern state's exclusion of African-American voters from primary elections (*Smith v. Allwright*, 1944); state judicial enforcement of racial "restrictive covenants" in housing (*Shelley v. Kraemer*, 1948); and "separate but equal" facilities for African-American professionals and graduate students in state universities (*Sweatt v. Painter* and *McLaurin v. Oklahoma State Regents*, both 1950).

I honor and praise him for his civil rights and professional achievements within our judicial system.

President John F. Kennedy appointed Marshall to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit in 1961. Four years later, President Lyndon B. Johnson appointed him Solicitor General of the United States.

President Johnson nominated Marshall to the Supreme Court of the United States and the Senate confirmed the appointment on August 30, 1967, making Marshall the first African-American justice to sit on the Court. Marshall served 23 years on the Supreme Court, retiring on June 27, 1991, at the age of 82.

After his death an article in the *Washington Afro-American* stated, "We make movies about Malcolm X, we get a holiday to honor Dr. Martin Luther King, but every day we live the legacy of Justice Thurgood Marshall."

PULL FEDERAL FUNDING FROM BROOKLYN MUSEUM OF ART

HON. JOHN E. SWEENEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1999

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a resolution along with Mr. FOSSELLA, that calls for an elimination of federal funds for the Brooklyn Museum of Art if it proceeds with an exhibit that desecrates religion.

The Museum, which has come under fire for using taxpayer money to host an exhibit featuring a portrait of the Virgin Mary smeared with elephant dung, has received more than \$700,000 from the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities over the past three years.

John Cardinal O'Connor, in published new accounts, called the exhibit "an attack on religion itself and, in a special way, on the Catholic Church." In fact, it is an affront to the more than one billion Catholics worldwide!

In addition to the Virgin Mary painting, the art show titled, "Sensation: Young British Artists from the Saatchi Collection," also features a portrait of a convicted child murderer fashioned from small hand prints. Do we really want to glorify convicted murderers?!

I wholeheartedly agree with my colleague, Mr. FOSSELLA, who describes the exhibit as "little more than publicly-funded bigotry." He was correct in saying that "the American people have a right to know that their tax dollars are not being used to desecrate religion and promote bigotry."

When taxpayers decide to support the arts, I doubt these are the kinds of exhibits they have in mind. Our resolution will give a voice to the millions of Americans who are disgusted that they are being forced to fund this offensive exhibit. Furthermore, I believe that most of my constituents would join me in saying that this exhibit goes too far and is devoid of culturally redeeming value, by any standard.

Our federal tax dollars should not be spent on images that glorify immoral and criminal behavior. They should be used to defend not offend. Further, if we are to subsidize the expression of art, let that expression carry a message of education, not defecation.

We have no obligation to call it art and the American people don't have to subsidize it. While these so-called artists have a right to create their "art," and galleries have a right to display it, the First Amendment does not guarantee that the American people must subsidize it.

The City of New York has threatened to pull the museum's funding, and so too should the federal government.

Again, I urge my colleagues to continue to cosponsor this important resolution.

INDEPENDENCE DAY FOR CYPRUS

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, October 1, 1999

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Republic of Cyprus on the 39th anniversary of its independence.

As we celebrate this important day, we are sadly reminded of the political impasse which continues to divide the island into two communities. However, recent seismic shifts in the region give hope to optimists who believe that for the first time in many years we could see progress towards a fair and just settlement on this island nation.

Even before the recent tragic earthquakes that rocked Turkey and Greece in August and September, we were seeing fissures in the previously frozen relations between the two nations. The far sighted leadership of Foreign Ministers Papandreou and Cem brought them together to talk in a meaningful way about coordinating policy in the wake of the crisis in Kosovo—breaking the silence which had stifled dialogue between Athens and Ankara since the invasion of Cyprus.

Little could they have imagined that serious earthquakes this year would take the lives of thousands in the region and elicit such profound and heartfelt responses from the peoples of each country towards their neighbors in times of crisis. The outpouring of assistance and sympathy during these consecutive tragedies demonstrated that the citizens of Greece and Turkey were following the lead of their respective foreign ministers in acknowledging that no country is an island.

Neither political tremors touched off by Slobodan Milosevic's military aggression nor